

Remarks/Arguments

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,452,910 to Vij et al. Vij et al. relates to a wireless bridge which couples a Bluetooth PAN network to a LAN network. Since a Bluetooth network has different characteristics and operates on a different frequency from a LAN network, the wireless bridge requires a link manager protocol (LMP) which is part of the Bluetooth standard. A link manager carries out link setup, authentication, link configuration and other protocols. It discovers other remote managers and communicates with them via the link manager protocol. This is all within the Bluetooth network.

Claim 1 specifically recites a link management module for managing associations with an access point of a centralized wireless network. Nowhere does Vij et al. show or suggest this structure. Nowhere does Vij et al. show or suggest any management by their LMP of associations within an access point of the centralized wireless LAN. Rather, Vij et al. only teaches control by their LMP of devices within the Bluetooth PAN network. It is therefore clear that the patent to Vij et al. does not affect the patentability of Claim 1.

Furthermore, Claim 1 specifically recites that the device for connecting one wireless network to at least one other network comprises a link management module for managing associations with an access point of a centralized wireless network and devices of networks connected to the bridge module other than the wireless network. Nowhere is this structure shown or suggested by Vij et al. Rather, in Vij et al, since the wireless bridge only links the PAN to the LAN, the Bluetooth vehicle module is effectively in the LAN. However, because there is no link management module in the wireless bridge, there is no management of associations on the wireless network. As a result, the Bluetooth vehicle module becomes a

temporary site on the LAN, but can do nothing else. In the instant invention, the inclusion of a link management module in a device of the network allows devices coupled to the link management module to be included in the network, and to communicate within the centralized wireless network. Nowhere does Vij et al teach or suggest this structure. It is therefore clear that the patent to Vij et al. does not affect the patentability of Claim 1.

Claims 2-9 are dependent from Claim 1 and set forth further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that Claims 2-9 are patentable as their parent Claim 1.

Cited U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0181412A1 to Shibasaki relates to a standing tree bridge. Nowhere does Shibasaki teach or suggest a bridge module comprising a link management module for managing associations with an access point of a centralized wireless network, as specifically set forth in Claim 1. It is therefore clear that Shibasaki does not affect the patentability of Claim 1, much less the patentability of any subclaim.

Cited U.S. Patent 5,570,366 to Baker et al. relates to filtering by a bridge based access point. Nowhere does Baker et al. teach or suggest a link management module for managing associations with an access point of a central wireless network, as specifically recited in Claim 1. It is therefore clear that the patent to Baker et al. does not affect the patentability of Claim 1, much less any of the subclaims.

The Applicants have reviewed the cited references to Shizume, Wallace, and LeMaire et al, which have not been relied upon by the Examiner, and believe that none are any more pertinent to the claimed invention than the references relied upon by the Examiner.

The Applicants submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Serial No. 10/660,141
Customer No. 24498

PF030065

Respectfully submitted,
SÉBASTIEN PERROT et.al.

By: Catherine A. Ferguson
Catherine A. Ferguson
(609) 734-6440
Reg. No. 40,877

Thomson Licensing Inc.
Patent Operations
Two Independence Way, Suite 200
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

9 February 2006